



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/823,298

04/12/2004

Liping Ren

0400198

4746

25700

7590

10/15/2009

FARJAMI & FARJAMI LLP

26522 LA ALAMEDA AVENUE, SUITE 360

MISSION VIEJO, CA 92691

EXAMINER

PIZARRO CRESPO, MARCOS D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2814

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/15/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/823,298	Applicant(s) REN, LIPING	
	Examiner Marcos D. Pizarro	Art Unit 2814	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9,11,13 and 20-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9,11,13,20-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Attorney's Docket Number: IR-2390 (2-3965)

Filing Date: 4/12/2004

Claimed Priority Date: 4/11/2003 (Provisional 60/462,562)

Applicant(s): Ren

Examiner: Marcos D. Pizarro

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action responds to the amendment filed on 8/3/2009.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after the final rejection mailed on 4/2/2009. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/3/2009 has been entered.

Acknowledgment

2. The amendment filed on 8/3/2009, responding to the Office action mailed on 4/2/2009, has been entered. The present Office action is made with all the suggested amendments being fully considered. Accordingly, pending in this Office action are claims 1-7, 9, 11, 13, and 20-23.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2814

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 9, 11, 13, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujishima (US6740952) in view of Tada (US6525390), Rumennik (US6639277), Van Zant, Gandhi, Noda (US6617652), and Ranjan (US5801431).

5. Regarding claim 1, Fujishima shows (see, *e.g.*, fig. 19) most aspects of the instant invention including a semiconductor device comprising:

- ✓ A semiconductor substrate **1** of a first conductivity type
- ✓ A semiconductor layer of a second conductivity type formed over the substrate **1**
- ✓ A body region **2** of the first conductivity formed in the semiconductor layer
- ✓ An invertible channel in the body region **2**
- ✓ A source region **3** of the second conductivity type formed in the body region **2** and adjacent to the channel
- ✓ A gate structure formed over the channel region including:
 - a gate electrode **9**
 - a gate insulation layer **7** spacing the gate electrode **9** from the channel
- ✓ A drain region **6** formed in the semiconductor layer
- ✓ A drift region **5** in the semiconductor layer spacing the body region **2** from the drain region **6**
- ✓ A field plate structure disposed over the drift region **5** including:
 - a first insulation layer **8** of a first thickness extending from the gate insulation layer

- a second insulation layer **10** of a second thickness formed over the first insulation layer **8**
- a third insulation layer **25** of a third thickness
- a first plate **9** disposed over the first insulation layer **8**
- a second plate **FP1** disposed over the second insulation layer **8**
- a third plate **FP2/FP3** spaced from the second plate **FP1** by the third insulation layer **25**

Wherein:

- ✓ the first plate **9** includes a first portion extending from the gate electrode (see, *e.g.*, fig. 19)
- ✓ the second plate **FP1** includes (see, *e.g.*, fig. 19):
 - a first portion
 - a second portion
 - a second gap separating the portions
- ✓ the third plate includes (see, *e.g.*, fig. 19):
 - a first portion **FP2**
 - a second portion **FP3**
 - a third gap **Wg** separating the portions
- ✓ the second gap is wider than the third gap **Wg** (see, *e.g.*, fig. 19)
- ✓ the device exhibits a breakdown voltage of at least 600 volts (see, *e.g.*, col.35/III.1-3)

6. Fujishima, however, fails to show a resurf region of the first conductivity type in the semiconductor layer, wherein the resurf region is formed over at least a portion of the drift region between the body region and the drain region, and wherein the resurf region is adjacent to and in contact with the drain region. Tada, on the other hand, shows a resurf region **44** of the first conductivity type in a semiconductor layer, wherein the resurf region is formed over at least portion of a drift region **3** between a body region **2** and a drain region **6**, and wherein the resurf region is adjacent to and in contact with the drain region (see, *e.g.*, fig. 10). He further teaches that said resurf region would secure certain breakdown voltage, would facilitate obtaining a stable and reliable breakdown voltage, and would reduce the on-resistance of Fujishima's device (see, *e.g.*, Tada: col.12/ll.17-37).

7. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the resurf region of Tada in the semiconductor layer of Fujishima to facilitate obtaining a stable and reliable breakdown voltage and reduce the on-resistance of the device.

8. Fujishima, however, fails to show the first plate including a second portion spaced from the first portion of the first plate by a first gap wider than the second gap, wherein said second portion is electrically connected to the drain region. Rumennik (see, *e.g.*, figs. 1 and 2), on the other hand, shows a first plate similar to Fujishima including a first portion **12** spaced from a second portion **26** by a gap wider than the gap separating first and second portions **10,11** of a second plate above the first plate. The second portion **26** is electrically connected to the drain region **19** and would function to

increase the breakdown voltage of Fujishima (see, *e.g.*, Rumennik: figs. 1 and 2, and col.4/ll.42-45).

9. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the second portion suggested by Rumennik in the first plate of Fujishima to reduce the field concentration at the boundary between the drain region and the drift region.

10. Fujishima also fails to show the semiconductor layer being epitaxially formed and extending below the body region. Rumennik, on the other hand, shows the semiconductor layer being epitaxially formed (see, *e.g.*, col.7/ll.21) and extending below the body region (see, *e.g.*, fig.5 and fig.6). Van Zant (see, *e.g.*, pp.382), on the other hand, teaches that epitaxially forming Fujishima's semiconductor layer would allow accurate control of the doping concentrations of the layer. Ghandhi (see, *e.g.*, pp.258) teaches that epitaxially forming Fujishima's semiconductor layer on the substrate would eliminate the problems of compatibility or mismatch between the layer and the substrate.

11. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to epitaxially form Fujishima's semiconductor layer, as suggested by Van Zant and Ghandhi, to eliminate compatibility problems between the layer and the substrate and to accurately control the doping concentrations of the layer.

12. Fujishima fails to show the first and second portions of the second field plate, and the first and second portions of the third field plate being disposed around the drain region. Noda, on the other hand, teaches (see, *e.g.*, fig. 1) that annular circular plates

formed concentrically around the drain diffusion region of Fujishima would improve the breakdown properties of the device (see, *e.g.*, Noda/col.14/ll.20-22 and col.9/ll.38). Ranjan elaborates by teaching that the series of plates in Noda reduce the tendency to concentrate high electric fields near the surface of the device thereby improving its breakdown voltage (see, *e.g.*, Ranjan/col.5/ll.52-56).

13. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the first and second portions of the second and third plates of Fujishima/Rumennik as annular portions disposed around the drain region, as suggested by Noda and Ranjan, to further improve the breakdown voltage properties of the device.

14. Regarding claims 2, 4, and 6, Fujishima shows the first **8**, second **10** and third **25** insulation layers comprising an oxide (see, *e.g.*, fig. 19)

15. Regarding claim 3, Fujishima shows the first thickness is 0.6 microns (see, *e.g.*, col.36/ll.20) but fails to specify the claimed thickness of 0.4 microns. However, differences in thickness will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such thickness is critical. "Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the workable ranges by routine experimentation". *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454,456,105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

16. Fujishima also teaches that the first thickness, as well as the other thicknesses of the different insulation layers, affects the performance and the area of the device (see, *e.g.*, col.37/ll.15-29, col.8/ll.36-40, and col.39/ll.17-31). Therefore, it is necessary to

ensure that the insulation layers are of an appropriate thickness (see, *e.g.*, Fujishima/col.35/ll.60-62). The specific claimed first thickness, *i.e.*, 0.4 microns, absent any criticality, is only considered to be the “optimum” thickness disclosed by Fujishima that a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been able to determine using routine experimentation based, among other things, on the desired device performance, manufacturing costs, etc. (see Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980)), and since neither non-obvious nor unexpected results, *i.e.*, results which are different in kind and not in degree from the results of the prior art, will be obtained as long as the first thickness provides for a stable performance of the device, as already suggested by Fujishima.

17. Since the applicant has not established the criticality (see next paragraph below) of the claimed thickness of 0.4 microns, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use these values in the device of Fujishima.

CRITICALITY

18. The specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed thickness or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen dimensions or upon another variable recited in a claim, the applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

19. Regarding claim 5, Fujishima shows the second thickness is 1.3 microns (see, *e.g.*, col.39/ll.5).

20. Regarding claim 7, Fujishima shows the third thickness is 2.5 microns (see, *e.g.*, col.39/ll.7) instead of the claimed thickness of 1.4 microns. See also the comments stated above in paragraphs 14-17 with respect to the differences between the claimed thickness and that of the prior art, which are considered repeated here.

21. Regarding claim 9, Fujishima shows the first field plate **9** comprising gate electrode material (see, e.g., col.39/ll.9-10). Van Zant (see, e.g., pp. 511), on the other hand, teaches that doped polysilicon is the standard gate electrode material for Fujishima's device.

22. Regarding claim 11, Fujishima shows that the gap between the portions of the second field plate **FP1** is 45 microns (see, e.g., col.37/ll.29-34 and col.39/ll.13-16).

23. Regarding claim 13, Fujishima shows the third field plate **FP2** comprising a first portion and a second portion (see, e.g., fig. 19), wherein a gap of 25 microns separates the portions (see, e.g., col.37/ll.32).

24. Regarding claim 20, Fujishima shows the first portion of the first plate **9** terminating below the first portion of the second plate **FP1** (see, e.g., fig. 19).

25. Regarding claim 21, Fujishima shows the second portion of the second field plate **FP1** is electrically connected to the drain region **6** and to the second portion of the third plate **FP2** (see, e.g., fig. 19).

26. Regarding claim 22, Fujishima shows the first portion of the second plate **FP1** is electrically connected to the first portion of first plate **9** (see, e.g., fig. 19).

27. Regarding claim 23, Fujishima shows the first portion of the third plate **FP2** is electrically connected to the source region **3** (see, e.g., fig. 19).

Response to Arguments

28. The applicant argues:

29. Fujishima fails to disclose a first plate having a second portion electrically connected to a drain region.

30. The examiner responds:

31. The prior art of record clearly shows these features of the claimed invention. See, e.g., figs. 1 and 2, where Rumennik shows a first plate having a second portion **26** electrically connected to a drain region **19**.

32. The applicant argues:

33. Region **44** of Tada has a p-type concentration of $3 \times 10^{16}/\text{cm}^3$ (see, e.g., Tada: col.12/ll.17-28). However, as disclosed by Ranjan (cited by the examiner), high breakdown voltage is achieved when the charge in the resurf layer is controlled at approximately $1 \times 10^{12}/\text{cm}^2$ and the charge in the lower resurf layer is controlled at 1.5 to $2 \times 10^{12}/\text{cm}^2$ (see, e.g., Ranjan: col.1/ll.33-37). Thus, region **44** is not a resurf region.

34. The examiner responds:

35. The value of $3 \times 10^{16}/\text{cm}^3$ given in Tada is the volumetric p-type impurity concentration of the resurf region **44**. The values of $1 \times 10^{12}/\text{cm}^2$ and 1.5 - $2.0 \times 10^{12}/\text{cm}^2$ given in Ranjan are the charge densities per unit area of the resurf regions. In an effort to prove that region **44** of Tada is not a resurf region, the applicants equate the charge densities of Ranjan to the impurity concentration of Tada. The applicants concluded that region **44** of Tada is not a resurf region because the impurity concentration of the surface region **44** of Tada is different than what Ranjan teaches are the optimal charge area densities for the resurf regions in a double resurf device.

36. However, although there is a correlation between the impurity concentration and the charge area density (see, e.g., Ranjan: col.3/ll.39-44), equating the two as the applicants are doing in the above argument is wrong. The charge area density would not only depend on the impurity concentration but also on the thickness of the region (see, e.g., Ranjan: col.3/ll.39-44). In addition, the mathematical units are different. Tada reports the impurity concentration in cm^{-3} , whereas Ranjan reports the charge area densities in cm^{-2} . This would be the equivalent of saying that 1 cm^2 is the same as

1 cm³. Accordingly, Ranjan fails to support applicant's argument that region **44** of Tada is not a resurf region.

Conclusion

37. Papers related to this application may be submitted directly to Art Unit 2814 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit 2814 via the Art Unit 2814 Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (15 November 1989). The Art Unit 2814 Fax Center number is **(571) 273-8300**. The Art Unit 2814 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Art Unit 2814 applications.

38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Marcos D. Pizarro** at **(571) 272-1716** and between the hours of 10:00 AM to 8:30 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Thursday or by e-mail via Marcos.Pizarro@uspto.gov. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy, can be reached on (571) 272-1705.

39. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

Art Unit: 2814

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

40. The following list is the Examiner's field of search for the present Office Action:

Field of Search	Date
U.S. Class / Subclass(es): 257/335-343,409,487,488,491-493,659	10/12/2009
Other Documentation:	
Electronic Database(s): EAST (USPAT, EPO, JPO)	10/12/2009

/Marcos D. Pizarro/

Marcos D. Pizarro
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2814
571-272-1716
marcos.pizarro@uspto.gov